

primarily military equipment that Iran alleges it did not receive. The equipment was purchased pursuant to commercial contracts with more than 50 private American companies. Iran alleges that it suffered direct losses and consequential damages in excess of \$2 billion in total because of the U.S. Government's refusal to allow the export of the equipment after January 19, 1981, in alleged contravention of the Algiers Accords. As directed by the Tribunal, the United States' submission addresses Iran's claims regarding both liability and compensation and damages.

5. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission ("FCSC") on February 24, 1995, successfully completed its case-by-case review of the more than 3,000 so-called "small claims" against Iran arising out of the 1979 Islamic revolution. These "small claims" (of \$250,000 or less each) were originally filed before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal, but were transferred to the FCSC pursuant to the May 13, 1990 Settlement Agreement between Iran and the United States.

The FCSC issued decisions on 3,066 claims for total awards of \$86,555,795. Of that amount, \$41,570,936 represented awards of principal and \$44,984,859 represented awards of interest. Although originally only \$50 million were available to pay these awards, the funds earned approximately \$9 million in interest over time, for a total settlement fund of more than \$59 million. Thus, all awardees will receive full payment on the principal amounts of their awards, with interest awards paid on a pro rata basis.

The FCSC's awards to individuals and corporations covered claims for both real and personal property seized by Iran. In addition, many claims arose out of commercial transactions, including contracts for the sale of goods and contracts for the supply of services such as teaching, medical treatment, data processing, and shipping. The FCSC is now working with the Department of the Treasury to facilitate final payment on all FCSC awards.

6. The situation reviewed above continues to implicate important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals and presents an unusual challenge to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The Iranian Assets Control Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12170 continue to play an important role in structuring our relationship with Iran and in enabling the United States to implement properly the Algiers Accords. Similarly, the Iranian Transactions Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12613 continue to advance important objectives in combating international terrorism. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 18, 1995.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. WALKER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MARTINI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KIM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### HOW BUDGET AND RESCISSION BILL AFFECT PROGRAMS FOR OUR STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, much of the debate today and yesterday about the budget and also the rescissions bill focused on programs for seniors, particularly Medicare and also Medicaid to the extent that it also impacts senior citizens, and I had previously spo-

ken on the floor and stated emphatically how part of my opposition to the budget was based on the fact that it does have significant cuts in Medicare and how that will negatively impact our senior citizens. What I wanted to speak about today very briefly though are the parts of the budget, as well as the rescissions bill that we voted on today, that affect programs for students at our universities and or colleges.

Mr. Speaker, I happened to have a forum during the April break at Rutgers University, which is in my district, and at the forum a number of students expressed concern with the cost of higher education, how tuition continues to rise, how difficult it is not only at private schools, but also at public schools such as Rutgers University, to continue to meet educational expenses and how many students increasingly have to simply drop out of school because they cannot afford to pay the cost of higher education.

I say to my colleagues, "If you look at the two resolutions or bills that we passed today, in one case the budget and in the other case the rescissions bill, both of them in my opinion rely too heavily on cuts in programs for higher education, particularly as it affects students who are looking for scholarships, grants or student loans. The budget itself actually assumes a change in the current law to require college students to pay interest on student loans while they are still in school. Many students rely on Stafford loans or guaranteed student loans to pay for their colleges education or to pay for a significant portion of it."

Mr. Speaker, part of the problem is that under this budget measure the assumption is that while the students are at school they will have to pay back the interest on the loans. It is variously estimated, depending on how long you stay in school, for example, for undergraduate education, if you were to take the maximum student loan over the course of the four years, that you would end up paying as much as 20 percent more for your student loan after you graduate. If you defer your higher education and go to graduate school or professional school, the cost of that interest could even be higher as a percentage of what you have to pay back.

The rescission bill today also makes some significant rescissions or cuts, if you will, in Pell grants, which are grants that students receive to go to college who tend to be lower income, and also rescinds other additional money that is available for Federal direct student loans.

Now some people have said to me, "Well, what does it matter, Congressman PALLONE, that you know students have to pay more for their student loans or they don't get as much money for grants or scholarships? After all, they can always go out and work for a

few years and then come back to college later." But I think that is ignoring two realities. One is that increasingly the cost of higher education is such that it is not that easy to take time off, and make up the money, and then go back to school; and, secondly, that we are in a world where we are competing with other countries, and, if we have to set up the higher education system where many of our students have to defer going to college for a number of years before they can go because they have to work on the private sphere in order to pay for it, well, we are losing people, a lot of people, who would otherwise receive a higher education and be a productive member of the work force in the career that they have chosen and perhaps that they will be best at.

I also think it ignores the fact that in the last 29 or 30 years many of us were able to take advantage, including myself, of these student loan programs and grants programs, and now we are seeing those of future generations will not be able to take advantage of them. I think it is a mistake on our part to cut back on funding for higher education. You have to think about educating our students and educating our fellow Americans. If we do not provide that commitment that has been traditionally provided for the last generation or two to pay and provide Federal help for higher education the way we have, then it really says a lot about the value of education in our society. It says we do not value it very much.

So, even though both measures, both the budget and the rescission bill passed today; I did vote against both of them in part because of the impact on Medicare and Medicaid on senior citizens, but also in a major part because of the effect on higher education, and the student loans, and the student grants that so many of our students increasingly depend upon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### THE REINCARNATION OF TV MARTI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Madam Speaker, I am certainly not a fan of the Republican budget resolution. But there was one item in it that made a whole lot of sense—the idea of terminating TV Marti. It is long past time we stopped spending \$12 million a year to beam to Cuba in the middle of the night TV programs that nobody sees.

I was pleased when Chairman KASICH took on the powerful Cuban-American

lobby and proposed eliminating their pet project. And on this point, it sure looked like the committee intended to go along with that proposal.

At the markup on May 10th, the Budget Committee had before it both budget figures and a document with policy assumptions on how to meet those budget goals. The policy document listed a decision to "terminate broadcasting to Cuba" as one of the cuts needed to achieve the budget-cutting goals for the international assistance portion of the budget.

The draft committee report circulated on May 12, after the committee passed the budget resolution, stated:

Overseas broadcasting played an important role during the cold war, but has become and expensive anachronism with the advent of global satellite television broadcasting. Likewise, the technology used by Voice of America and WorldNet limits their potential audiences and makes those systems inefficient and expensive. TV Marti has achieved little success broadcasting to Cuba.

Any reasonable person would interpret all this to mean that the Committee supported termination. Many observers of the budget process reached this conclusion. The Federal Page of the Washington Post on May 11 listed "Terminate Voice of America and Radio Marti broadcasts to Cuba" as one of the items in its "'House Republicans' Blueprint to Balance the Budget." (p.A21) The Miami Herald in a May 14 page one story called "Cuban exiles losing clout in D.C." reported, "To help balance the U.S. budget by 2002, the House budget committee called for eliminating funding for (Radio and TV Marti) next fiscal year." (p.1.)

Then a most amazing thing happened. The final version of the committee report that was filed on May 15 reversed the Committee's apparent policy decision to terminate TV Marti. The sentence "TV Marti has achieved little success broadcasting to Cuba" was deleted. All the rest of the paragraph declaring overseas broadcasting "an expensive anachronism" remained intact. But where first appeared the admission that TV Marti was a flop, there now magically appeared the wholly contradictory statement that "Funding, however, is available for Radio and TV Marti."

This is an interesting situation. The report now recommends getting rid of all USIA broadcasting programs—VOA, Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe—but makes a specific exception for TV and Radio Marti.

What happened over the weekend that resulted in this complete reversal? Who pressured Chairman KASICH to turn around on this and rewrite the report language? And what else in this budget has been changed after the committee vote? This is yet another demonstration of how difficult it is to kill a program, even when the program does not work.

I want to give credit to Chairman KASICH for his effort to go beyond generalities, to details, in his budget resolution. This experience with TV Marti

gives new meaning to that old saw, that the devil is in the details. It also, I am afraid, undermines the credibility of the entire exercise.

#### THE INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce today, along with a number of our colleagues, the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995.

This legislation, which is the product of many months of careful deliberation, would be the first comprehensive refuge reform bill since the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966. While that landmark statute, which was authored by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, nearly 30 years ago has served our Nation well, it is time that we update that law and, by so doing, improve the management of our Nation's wildlife refuge system.

At present, the system is comprised of 504 refuges, which are located in all 50 States and the 5 U.S. Territories, totaling about 91.7 million acres. These units range in size from the smallest, the 1-acre Mille Lacs National Wildlife Refuge in Minnesota, to the largest, the 19.3-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. In the last decade, 81 refuges and approximately 3.6 million acres have been added to the system.

While millions of Americans engage in various recreational activities each year on public lands within the system, there have been several recent developments that have caused great concern.

For instance, in October of 1993, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service settled a lawsuit filed by the National Audubon Society by agreeing to undertake a comprehensive system-wide "compatibility" study, to expeditiously terminate certain secondary uses, and to redirect their funds away from recreational and wildlife-dependent activities.

In addition, the Clinton administration has recommended that refuge funding be sharply reduced by deferring maintenance projects and upkeep of public use facilities, including trails, observation towers, and information kiosks. This recommendation is worrisome because without proper maintenance, the service may prohibit certain uses on our refuge lands.

While it is appropriate to periodically review the compatibility of certain activities, there is no statutory list of purposes for the national wildlife refuge system and no statutory definition of what constitutes a compatible use of a refuge. Without this guidance, individual wildlife managers have broad discretion to prevent or disallow recreational activities which do not materially affect the purposes of the refuge or the refuge system.

In fact, earlier this week my committee held a hearing on a bill to transfer the management of the Tishomingo National Wildlife Refuge to the State of Oklahoma. The overriding reason for H.R. 1112 was a decision by the local refuge manager to prohibit boating, camping, fishing, and picnicking in portions of the